

raise revenue, they may choose to function like lawyers and charge by the hour, not by the product or value of the service. No one wants to encourage the FAA to run up bills for the sake of raising money. There is much work that needs to be done to assign fees. The industry, the FAA, the Department and the Committee need to continue to work out the best way to accomplish our goal.

However, all parties must bear in mind that under the current set of assumptions, the FAA will need approximately \$59 billion through 2002. However, under the budget resolution calls for only \$47 billion. Somehow, we have got to recognize what this \$12 billion gap means. To put it in perspective, it could mean the closure or elimination of many services that are now provided. Like many situations, when we begin to downsize, the smallest communities tend to bear the brunt of cuts. Air traffic control towers at small airports, which are critical to the economic development of our small communities, could be the first to go. Flight service stations that handle general aviation traffic also could be on the first list of closures. In addition, do any of us really want to think of an air traffic control system with fewer controllers than we have today?

If current trends are correct, by the year 2002, we will have a 35-percent increase in passenger traffic, and an 18-percent increase in operations. Absent financial reform, the FAA will experience a 14-percent decline in funding. These statistics will mean only one thing—an FAA without an ability to meet its safety mission and without adequate funding to meet air traffic control demands.

Today, the Chicago center in Aurora experienced its second outage in recent months. I know the National Transportation Safety Board is looking into ATC problems now, but we must recognize that without the ability to modernize, and quickly, problems like Chicago may reoccur.

With respect to the bill, it does not create a corporation, nor does it make the agency independent. Instead, the bill strikes a balance. Regulatory and budget issues will be coordinated between the Secretary and the Administrator. In other areas such as personnel and procurement, the Administrator will have authority. These changes are important and will change how FAA manages its business. The goal, and one we all share, is an FAA with the ability to act quickly, and be able to count on funding.

The bill today asks many segments of the industry for help in supporting the FAA's mission. I do not ask airlines, manufacturers, and others for their financial support lightly and I know that bill be controversial. But something has got to change.

I have a choice—I can look at the FAA, and the budget assumptions and do nothing, or I can work to make sure that the safety of the traveling public

is protected. After 21 years in Congress, having spent many years as Aviation Subcommittee chairman and now ranking Democrat, I can tell you that we have got to act. The bottom line, unfortunately, is that the travelling public simply can not count on funding for the FAA under the drive to balance the budget.

To those that will object, we will continue to work with you on FAA reform. There is much we agree on, and a lot of work to be done. I also want to point out that while the House bill differs from the bill we are introducing today, we share a common goal—a better FAA.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 743

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST] was added as a cosponsor of S. 743, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for investment necessary to revitalize communities within the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 794

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 794, a bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to facilitate the minor use of a pesticide, and for other purposes.

S. 959

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 959, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage capital formation through reductions in taxes on capital gains, and for other purposes.

S. 969

At the request of Mr. BRADLEY, the names of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] were added as cosponsors of S. 969, a bill to require that health plans provide coverage for a minimum hospital stay for a mother and child following the birth of the child, and for other purposes.

S. 978

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] was added as a cosponsor of S. 978, a bill to facilitate contributions to charitable organizations by codifying certain exemptions from the Federal securities laws, to clarify the inapplicability of antitrust laws to charitable gift annuities, and for other purposes.

S. 1113

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1113, a bill to reduce gun trafficking by prohibiting bulk purchases of hand guns.

S. 1161

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming

[Mr. SIMPSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1161, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt small manufacturers, producers and importers from the firearms excise tax.

AMENDMENT NO. 2514

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the names of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2514 proposed to H.R. 4, a bill to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending, and reduce welfare dependence.

AMENDMENT NO. 2565

At the request of Mr. ROBB, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2565 proposed to H.R. 4, a bill to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending, and reduce welfare dependence.

AMENDMENT NO. 2575

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2575 proposed to H.R. 4, a bill to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending, and reduce welfare dependence.

AMENDMENT NO. 2589

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2589 proposed to H.R. 4, a bill to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending, and reduce welfare dependence.

AMENDMENT NO. 2603

At the request of Mr. FAIRCLOTH, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2603 proposed to H.R. 4, a bill to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending, and reduce welfare dependence.

At the request of Mr. GRAMM, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2603 proposed to H.R. 4, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 2668

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2668 proposed to H.R. 4, a bill to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending, and reduce welfare dependence.

SENATE RESOLUTION 171—RELATIVE TO THE ISRAELI-PAL-ESTINIAN DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. PELL) submitted the following resolutions; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 171

Whereas the Bush Administration and the Clinton Administration have both worked relentlessly to build on the Middle East peace process that began in Madrid in October 1991, with the goal of achieving a comprehensive, lasting peace between Israel and all its neighbors;

Whereas on September 13, 1993, the first major breakthrough of the Madrid peace process was achieved when Israel and the Palestinians signed the Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements on the White House lawn;

Whereas September 13, 1995 marks the second anniversary of this important breakthrough;

Whereas the United States has pledged to support the Israel-Palestinian Declaration of Principles through diplomatic and political efforts, the provision of assistance, and other means;

Whereas the May 4, 1994 Cairo Agreement between Israel and the Palestinians resulted in the withdrawal of the Israeli army from the Gaza Strip and the Jericho Area and the establishment of a Palestinian Authority with responsibility for those areas;

Whereas Israel and the Palestinian Authority are continuing negotiations on the redeployment of Israeli troops out of Arab population centers in the West Bank, the expansion of the Palestinian Authority's jurisdiction into the areas vacated by the Israeli army, and the convening of elections for a Palestinian council;

Whereas the Israeli-Palestinian Declaration of Principles helped pave the way for the October 25, 1994 signing of a full peace treaty between Israel and Jordan, which established full diplomatic relations and pledged to resolve all future disputes by peaceful means;

Whereas the Israeli-Jordanian peace treaty has resulted in rapid normalization and unprecedented cooperation between the two nations in security, economic development, the environment, and other areas;

Whereas the Israeli-Palestinian Declaration of Principles helped pave the way for Israel to establish low-level diplomatic relations with Morocco and Tunisia, and to initiate official contacts with Qatar, Oman, and Bahrain;

Whereas the six nations of the Gulf Cooperation Council have announced their decision to end all enforcement of the secondary and tertiary boycotts of Israel;

Whereas extremists opposed to the Middle East peace process continue to use terrorism to undermine the chances of achieving a comprehensive peace, including on August 21, 1995, when a suicide bomber blew up a bus in Jerusalem, killing one American and four Israeli civilians;

Whereas the issue of security and preventing acts of terrorism is and must remain of paramount importance in the Israeli-Palestinian negotiations; and

Whereas compliance by the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Palestinian Authority with all of their solemn commitments is essential to the success of the peace process: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses its support for the Israeli-Palestinian Declaration of Principles on the second anniversary of its historic signing;

(2) supports the efforts of Israel and the Palestinians to conclude an agreement on implementation of the second phase of the Declaration of Principles;

(3) condemns, in the strongest possible terms, all acts of terrorism aimed at undermining the Israeli-Palestinian peace negotiations and other tracks of the Middle East peace process, and calls upon all parties to take all necessary steps to prevent such acts;

(4) calls upon the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Palestinian Authority to comply with all of their commitments;

(5) welcomes the progress made toward peace between Israel and its neighbors;

(6) commends those Middle Eastern leaders who have committed to resolve their differences through only peaceful means;

(7) reiterates its belief that a comprehensive, lasting peace between Israel and its neighbors is in the national interest of the United States;

(8) encourages all participants in the Middle East peace process to continue working to achieve lasting peace agreements while adhering fully to all commitments made and agreements reached thus far;

(9) calls upon the Arab states to demonstrate their commitment to peace by completely dismantling the Arab boycott of Israel in its primary, secondary, and tertiary aspects; and

(10) strongly supports the Middle East peace process and seeks to effect policies that will help the peace process reach a successful conclusion.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, 2 years ago today, my colleagues and I were privileged to witness a historic moment on the White House lawn: the signing of the Israeli-Palestinian Declaration of Principles.

Today, on behalf of myself, Senator BROWN, Senator LIEBERMAN, and Senator PELL I am submitting a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on this important anniversary.

This resolution very simply expresses the Senate's support for the declaration of principles, its recognition of the progress that has been achieved in the Middle East peace process, and its commitment to help the process reach a successful conclusion.

The Middle East has changed so much in the last 4 years that we often take the changes for granted. But it sometimes bears reviewing how much has been achieved in such a short time.

Think of it:

Four years ago, before the Madrid conference in October 1991, Israel had never sat face-to-face in peace talks with most of its Arab neighbors. Today, meetings between Israeli and Arab officials—from Israel's immediate neighbors, from the Persian Gulf States, and from North Africa—are so routine and so numerous that they scarcely receive mention in the news media.

Just over 2 years ago, Israeli and Palestinian negotiators remained locked in a fruitless stalemate, and direct talks between Israel and the PLO were deemed impossible. Today, there is Palestinian self-rule in Gaza and Jericho, Israeli and Palestinian Authority are on the verge of reaching an agreement on Palestinian elections and further Israeli troop redeployments in the West Bank, and handshakes between Israeli and PLO leaders are commonplace.

Just over 1 year ago, Israel and Jordan remained officially in a state of war. Today, thanks to the courage and leadership of King Hussein and Prime Minister Rabin, Israel and Jordan have signed a full peace treaty, enjoy full diplomatic relations, and are contin-

ually expanding their cooperation in security, economic development, tourism, the environment, and many other areas.

Mr. President, no one would deny that peace has not yet been secured in the Middle East. Much, much work remains to be done. Although the Israeli-Syrian negotiations have at times showed promise, with senior Israeli and Syrian military officers holding substantive talks on the security arrangements that must accompany an agreement, these talks currently seem caught in a stalemate. Clearly, many hard rounds of negotiations remain.

Israel's talks with Lebanon are essentially on hold until there is an Israeli-Syrian deal. Israel and the Palestinians must continue to overcome obstacles to the implementation of their agreements, and their negotiations will get no easier once final status talks begin next year.

In addition, the peacemakers of the Middle East face continual opposition from those who would use terrorism to upset the peace process. We were reminded of this once on August 21 when a suicide bomber blew up a bus in Jerusalem, killing one American and four Israeli civilians. Like the suicide bombings that preceded it, this was a heinous and unforgivable act of terrorism.

All who are committed to peace must do everything in their power to prevent acts of terrorism. Nowhere is this more true than in the areas controlled by the Palestinian Authority. While the performance of Chairman Arafat's authority in security matters has improved with time, it must do even more to prevent and punish all terrorist acts. Suicide bombers and other extremists must not be allowed to succeed in their goal of preventing the arrival of peace.

But, the obstacles and the hard work ahead do not change the fact that real peace in the Middle East is today genuinely within reach, as it never has been before. The long-held dream of Israelis to live in peace with all their neighbors, in secure borders, is not a real possibility.

To bring this process to a successful conclusion, the parties themselves must make all the difficult decisions. But the support of the United States has always been essential to Middle East peacemaking, and it remains so today.

Presidents Bush and Clinton, and Secretaries of State Baker and Christopher, deserve enormous credit for their unyielding commitment to pursuing a comprehensive peace in the Middle East, and their efforts have earned them the respect and gratitude of parties throughout the region.

The Congress has also been consistent in its strong support of all efforts to advance the peace process, and expressions of that support help bolster the parties in their efforts. One recent expression of that support was the introduction of S. 1064, the Middle East

Peace Facilitation Act of 1995, which I was proud to cosponsor along with Senators HELMS, PELL, DOLE, DASCHLE, MACK, LIEBERMAN, MCCONNELL, LEAHY, and LAUTENBERG. This bill would allow the President to continue to provide assistance to the Palestinians and to conduct relations with the PLO, but it includes strict new language mandating compliance by the PLO and the Palestinian Authority with all of their commitments.

The resolution I am submitting today presents an opportunity for the Senate to mark an important milestone on the long road to peace between Israel and the Palestinians. As we take note of this day, let us also reiterate once again that the successful conclusion of a comprehensive peace in the Middle East is in the United States national interest, and that we in the U.S. Senate stand firmly behind all those who are committed to achieving that peace.

AMENDMENT SUBMITTED

THE WORK OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1995

SIMON (AND REID) AMENDMENT NO. 2681

Mr. SIMON (for himself and Mr. REID) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 2280 proposed by Mr. DOLE to the bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending, and reduce welfare dependence; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new title:

TITLE ____—COMMUNITY WORKS PROGRESS ACT

SEC. ____00. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Community Works Progress Act".

SEC. ____01. FUNDING FOR COMMUNITY WORKS PROGRESS PROGRAMS.

(a) SET-ASIDE OF AMOUNTS FROM BLOCK GRANTS FOR TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES.—

(1) REDUCTION IN STATE FAMILY ASSISTANCE GRANT AMOUNT.—Notwithstanding section 403(a)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 101(b) of this Act, no eligible State shall receive a grant in an amount equal to the amount otherwise determined under such section unless such amount is reduced by the amount determined under paragraph (2).

(2) AMOUNT DETERMINED.—The amount determined under this paragraph is the amount which bears the same ratio to \$240,000,000 (or, \$240,000,000 reduced by the amount, if any, available for such fiscal year in accordance with subsection (c), whichever is lesser) as the amount otherwise determined for such State under section 403(a)(2)(A) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 101(b) of this Act, (without regard to the reduction determined under this paragraph) bears to \$16,795,323,000.

(3) USE OF AMOUNTS APPROPRIATED FOR BLOCK GRANT.—Notwithstanding section 403(a)(4)(A) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 101(b) of this Act, \$240,000,000 of the amounts appropriated under such section shall be used for the purpose of paying grants beginning with fiscal

years after fiscal year 1996 to States for the operation of community works progress programs. Such amounts shall be paid to States in accordance with the requirements of this title and shall not be subject to any requirements of part A of title IV of the Social Security Act.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON COSTS.—

(1) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Not more than 10 percent of the amount of each grant awarded to a State may be used for administrative expenses.

(2) COMPENSATION AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES.—Not less than 70 percent of the amount of each grant awarded to a State may be used to provide compensation and supportive services to project participants.

(3) WAIVER OF COST LIMITATIONS.—The limitations under paragraphs (1) and (2) may be waived for good cause, as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(c) AMOUNTS REMAINING AVAILABLE FOR STATE FAMILY ASSISTANCE GRANTS.—Any amounts appropriated for making grants under this title for a fiscal year under section 403(a)(4)(A)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(2)(A)(4)(A)(i)) that are not paid as grants to States in accordance with this title in such fiscal year shall be available for making State family assistance grants for such fiscal year in accordance with subsection (a)(1) of such section.

SEC. ____01A. ESTABLISHMENT.

In the case of any fiscal year after fiscal year 1996, the Secretary of Labor (hereafter referred to in this title as the "Secretary") shall award grants to 4 States for the establishment of community works progress programs.

SEC. ____02. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title:

(1) COMMUNITY WORKS PROGRESS PROGRAM.—The terms "community works progress program" and "program" mean a program designated by a State under which the State will select governmental and nonprofit entities to conduct community works progress projects which serve a significant public purpose in fields such as health, social service, environmental protection, education, urban and rural development and redevelopment, welfare, recreation, public facilities, public safety, and child care.

(2) COMMUNITY WORKS PROGRESS PROJECT.—The terms "community works progress project" and "project" mean an activity conducted by a governmental or nonprofit entity that results in a specific, identifiable service or product that, but for this title, would not otherwise be done with existing funds and that supplements but does not supplant existing services.

(3) NONPROFIT ENTITY.—The term "nonprofit entity" means an organization—

(A) described in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

(B) exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

SEC. ____03. APPLICATIONS BY STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each State desiring to conduct, or to continue to conduct, a community works progress program under this title shall submit an annual application to the Secretary at such time and in such manner as the Secretary shall require. Such application shall include—

(1) identification of the State agency or agencies that will administer the program and be the grant recipient of funds for the State, and

(2) a detailed description of the geographic area in which the project is to be carried out, including such demographic and economic data as are necessary to enable the Secretary to consider the factors required by subsection (b).

(b) CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In reviewing all applications received from States desiring to conduct or continue to conduct a community works progress program under this title, the Secretary shall consider—

(A) the unemployment rate for the area in which each project will be conducted,

(B) the proportion of the population receiving public assistance in each area in which a project will be conducted,

(C) the per capita income for each area in which a project will be conducted,

(D) the degree of involvement and commitment demonstrated by public officials in each area in which projects will be conducted,

(E) the likelihood that projects will be successful,

(F) the contribution that projects are likely to make toward improving the quality of life of residents of the area in which projects will be conducted,

(G) geographic distribution,

(H) the extent to which projects will encourage team approaches to work on real, identifiable needs,

(I) the extent to which private and community agencies will be involved in projects, and

(J) such other criteria as the Secretary deems appropriate.

(2) INDIAN TRIBES AND URBANIZED AREAS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall ensure that—

(i) one grant under this title shall be awarded to a State that will conduct a community works progress project that will serve one or more Indian tribes; and

(ii) one grant under this title shall be awarded to a State that will implement a community works progress project in a city that is within an Urbanized Area (as defined by the Bureau of the Census).

(B) INDIAN TRIBE.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term "Indian tribe" means any Indian tribe, band, nation, or other organized group or community, including any Alaska Native village or regional or village corporation as defined in or established pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C.A. 1601 et seq.), which is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.

(c) MODIFICATION TO APPLICATIONS.—If changes in labor market conditions, costs, or other factors require substantial deviation from the terms of an application approved by the Secretary, the State shall submit a modification of such application to the Secretary.

SEC. ____04. PROJECT SELECTION BOARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Each State that receives a grant under this title shall establish a Project Selection Board (hereafter referred to as the "Board") in the geographic area or areas identified by the State under section ____03(b)(2).

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each Board shall be composed of 13 members who shall reside in the geographic area identified by the State under section ____03(b)(2). Subject to paragraph (2), the members of the Board shall be appointed by the Governor of the State in consultation with local elected officials in the geographic area.

(2) REPRESENTATIVES OF BUSINESS AND LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.—The Board—

(A) shall have at least one member who is an officer of a recognized labor organization; and

(B) shall have at least one member who is a representative of the business community.

(c) DUTIES OF THE BOARD.—The Board shall—